



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DIGEST OF OTHER RECENT VIRGINIA DECISIONS.

Supreme Court of Appeals.

Note.—In this department we give the syllabus of every case decided by the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, except of such cases as are reported in full.

QUEENSBURY et al. v. VIAL, et al.

June 13, 1918.

[96 S. E. 173.]

1. **Wills (§§ 356, 417*)—Probate—Impeachment.**—An heir cannot maintain a bill to impeach a will after the clerk has admitted it to probate and the clerk's order has not been appealed from for a period of more than one year; but the heir's remedy is by appeal from the order of the clerk, on which appeal he has a trial de novo in circuit court, conducted as provided in Code 1904, § 2542.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 13 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 767.]

2. **Wills (§ 225*)—Setting Aside—Equity—Powers.**—Courts of equity have no inherent jurisdiction to set aside wills on the ground of fraud, undue influence, or lack of testamentary capacity on the part of the testator; the only statutory jurisdiction conferred on the court in that respect being that given by Code 1904, § 2544.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 13 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 770.]

3. **Wills (§ 421*)—Impeaching Probate—Conclusiveness of Probate.**—The clerk of court in admitting a will to probate acts judicially, and his order cannot be collaterally assailed, since it is in effect a judgment that the will was duly executed and that all things necessary to the validity thereof were done.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 13 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 767.]

(Additional Syllabus by Editor.)

4. **Clerks of Court—Probate Jurisdiction.**—The probate jurisdiction of clerks in Virginia is purely statutory; and the statute bestowing the authority defines the limits of its exercise. The statute confers no general equity jurisdiction.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 2 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 834.]

5. **Executors and Administrators—Probate Jurisdiction.**—The probate jurisdiction of clerks and courts in Virginia is purely statutory; and the statute bestowing the authority defines the limit of its exercise. The statute confers no general equity jurisdiction.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 5 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 512.]

*For other cases see same topic and KEY-NUMBER in all Key-Numbered Digests and Indexes.

Appeal from Circuit Court, Chesterfield County.

Bill by J. B. Queensbury and others against Hilda Vial, née Hilda Rudolph, and her husband. From decree dismissing the bill, plaintiffs appeal. Affirmed.

O'Flaherty, Fulton & Byrd, of Richmond, for appellants.

Haskins Hobson, of Powhatan, for appellees.

PENNSYLVANIA R. CO. *v.* JENKINS.

June 13, 1918.

[96 S. E. 170.]

1. Appeal and Error (§ 1097 (1)*)—Former Appeal as Law of the Case.—On second appeal of a case, if the facts are substantially similar, nothing decided on the first appeal can be re-examined.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 1 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 651.]

2. Carriers (§ 336*)—Injury to Passenger—Contributory Negligence.—An employee of a locomotive works, accompanying dead engines in a freight train to destination, who without looking alighted from his engine to examine it immediately next to one of the main line passenger tracks of the company, upon which from his knowledge and experience of 20 years as locomotive engineer he must have known that trains were likely to pass at any moment, and as to which danger he had been cautioned twice upon the day of the accident, cannot recover, whether he was struck by an approaching passenger train just as he stepped from his engine, or just before he straightened up after having suddenly stepped from his engine.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 2 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 707.]

3. Trial (§ 252 (8)*)—Instruction—Applicability to Evidence.—Where it was manifested that there was no opportunity to save plaintiff from his own negligent act, instructing to the effect that the doctrine of discovered peril or of last clear chance might be applied was error.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 7 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 718.]

Error to Hustings Court of Richmond.

Action by C. W. Jenkins against the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. Verdict and judgment for plaintiff, and defendant brings error. Judgment reversed, and case remanded.

Eppa Hunton, Jr., and *Thos. B. Gay*, both of Richmond, for plaintiff in error.

O'Flaherty & O'Flaherty, of Richmond, for defendant in error.

*For other cases see same topic and KEY-NUMBER in all Key-Numbered Digests and Indexes.